

## REMARKS

### The Amendments

Claims 1, 12, 17, 18, and 21 have been amended to refer to an Fc “domain” of a human IgG1 immunoglobulin rather than an Fc region. This is supported in the specification at page 10, lines 4 and 31, page 15, line 1, and page 25, lines 10-12. This is merely a clarifying amendment and does not narrow the scope of the claims.

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to specify that the immunoconjugate protein binds to tissue factor. This is supported in the specification at page 4, line 15 and page 11, lines 14-16.

Claim 23 has been amended to delete reference to an effector domain in order to ensure proper antecedent basis in preceding claims.

Claims 55-57 have been amended to remove the term “human” from the phrase “the mutant form of factor VII” because there was no antecedent basis in the preceding claim.

These amendments do not add new matter and do not raise any issues for consideration.

### Objection to Claim 21 Under 37 CFR 1.75 ( c)

Claim 21 is said to be of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the effector domain previously recited is the Fc domain of a human IgG1 immunoglobulin. In addition the term “a” and “an” preceding the descriptions of each domain has been replaced with the term “said.” These amendments ensure that claim 21 is construed as being narrower than claim 1 from which it depends. This amendment is merely clarifying and does not raise any new issues for consideration.

### The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 21, 46, and 54-57 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 21, 46, and 54-57 are rejected as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

- a. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 21, 46, and 54 are said to be indefinite for reciting an “Fc region of a human IgG1 immunoglobulin.” An Fc region is said to be composed of two identical C-terminal heavy chains linked by disulfide bonds. The claims have been amended to recite the term “Fc domain of a human IgG1 immunoglobulin” to clarify that the targeting domain is attached to a monomeric form of the Fc portion, *i.e.*, a single polypeptide chain, rather than a dimeric form as implied by the use of the term “region.”
- b. Claims 55-57 are said to unclear in the use of the phrase “the mutant form of human factor VII” because there is insufficient antecedent basis in claim 1. This phrase has been amended to remove the word “human” from the phrase so that the amended phrase precisely matches the antecedent phrase in claim 1.
- c. Claims 55-57 are said to be unclear in reciting “is native factor VII.” The claims are said to be indefinite as to whether human factor VII is intended. This recitation in the claims has been amended to specify that the human form is intended.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments address all of the issues raised by the examiner under this statutory provision. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 21, 46 and 54-57 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 21, 46 and 54-57 are rejected because the specification allegedly does not enable the full scope of the claims. The specification allegedly enables an immunoconjugate protein comprising an Fc region of a human IgG1 immunoglobulin conjugated to a targeting domain comprising a mutant form of factor VII, *wherein the immunoconjugate binds tissue factor*, but not an immunoconjugate protein which does not bind to tissue factor. The claims have been amended to

incorporate this recitation, as suggested in the Office Action. Thus the claims are now of the same scope as the enablement which the PTO acknowledges that the specification provides.


Conclusion

All of the rejections have been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments have put the claims in condition for allowance. Should any issues remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve the issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2005

By:

  
Sarah A. Kagan  
Registration No. 32,141

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
Customer No. 22907